



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,224	07/24/2003	William O. Camp JR.	9314-45	4546
54414	7590	06/04/2007	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.			YUN, EUGENE	
P.O. BOX 37428			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RALEIGH, NC 27627			2618	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/626,224

Applicant(s)

CAMP, WILLIAM O.

Examiner

Eugene Yun

Art Unit

2618

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 1, the applicant argues that the Rasmusson reference does not teach encoding voice in short-range and cellular communication using at least one of an Enhanced Full Rate (EFR) codec and an Adaptive Multi-Rate (AMR) codec for communication. The arguments are correct except for the fact that the examiner cited Jones as teaching the above limitation, not Rasmusson. The arguments do not state why the Jones reference does not teach the above limitation. Regarding the arguments that the Rasmusson reference does not teach voice encoding, the term "voice encoding" is believed to be a standard very well known in the art for all cellular and digital communications. Most cellular systems known in the art include a vocoder, which performs voice encoding.

Regarding Claim 11, the applicant argues that the Jones reference does not teach selectively embedding control data in the first information based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode. The examiner disagrees largely due to the fact that the arguments do not specifically state why the Kosmi reference does not teach the above limitation, despite the cited passage pointing out the most major aspects of selectively embedding control data in the first information (col. 10, lines 62-64) based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode (col. 2, lines 54-60).

Regarding Claim 9, the applicant argues that the Komsí reference does not teach selectively convolutionally encoding information for transmission to a remote Bluetooth device by a Bluetooth module based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode. Again, the examiner disagrees largely due to the fact that the arguments do not specifically state why the Komsí reference does not teach the above limitation. The cited passage is therefore still believed to teach selectively convolutionally encoding information (col. 6, lines 25) for transmission to a remote Bluetooth device by a Bluetooth module based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode (see col. 6, lines 18-33).

Regarding Claim 10, the applicant argues that the Komsí reference does not teach selectively interleaving information over time for transmission to a remote Bluetooth device by a Bluetooth module based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode. Once again the arguments do not specifically state why the Komsí reference does not teach the above limitation. The cited passage is therefore still believed to teach selectively interleaving information over time (col. 6, lines 25) for transmission to a remote Bluetooth device by a Bluetooth module based on whether the remote Bluetooth device supports an enhanced communication mode (see col. 6, lines 18-33).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Eugene Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2618

EY


MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER